DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see appeal brief, filed July 8, 2011, with respect to the

rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under James et al in view of Lynch have been fully considered

and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon

further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Sibbitt (US

5,065,392).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by James

et al (US 6,108,739) in view of Lynch (US 6,931,430) in further view of Sibbitt (US

5,065,392).

Regarding claim 1, James et al discloses a process for programming actions of

resources in a network of domestic devices (Fig. 1), including the steps of:

sending a request for programming an action by a client application to a manager

of preprogrammed actions of a device of the network, the programming request

including a set of parameters defining the action including a time indication and a list of

resources involved in accomplishing the action (transactions disclosed in col. 6, lines

54-61, the request subaction having targeted, transaction label, transaction label,

sourceld disclosed in col. 7, lines 24-67, and the time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line

57 to col. 13, line 3),

verification by the actions manager that the resources involved in accomplishing

the action (request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry protocol,

CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34 and the time

stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to col. 13, line 3. Furthermore, the time stamp

provides a time for the action to be carried out),

transmission to the client application of a message of acceptance or of refusal of

the programming of the action on the part of the preprogrammed actions manager

depending on the result of the verification (request/resend protocol, reject/resend

protocol, busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to

col. 9, line 34); however, fails to disclose that the resources involved in accomplishing

the action will be available at a time when the action is to be carried out as specified by

the time indication.

Lynch teaches a system for verifying the resources are available for processing

and recording as seen in Figures 5a-5b and Figure 9. It is further described in Column

19 Lines 5-36 describes verifying the resources in order to determine if they are

available for further processing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the system as disclosed by

James et al, and further processes the data stream to indicate time indication of

recording as taught by Lynch, in order to allow for proper time management of

scheduled recordings.

Furthermore, Sibbitt teaches the verification of the programming schedule by

involving a processing unit in order to determine what resources are available (Column

7 Lines 60 through Column 8 Lines 31 and shown in Figure 9). The system allows for

the verifying of resources in order to provide efficient recording of the programming

stream. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to use the system as disclosed by James et al in view of Lynch,

and further incorporate a system the verifies resources, as taught by Sibbitt, in order to

allow for proper managing of the systems resources.

Regarding claim 2, James et al also discloses the claimed wherein the client

application selects a preprogrammed action manager situated in a device other than the

client application itself (the bridge 24 disclosed in col. 8, lines 45-50 and responder

disclosed in col. 7, lines 23-30).

Regarding claim 3, James et al discloses the claimed of step of storage by each

resource involved of its timetable with respect to the action (program instructions stored

in memories 16 disclosed in col. 6, lines 20-34 and the time stamp disclosed from col.

12, line 57 to col. 13, line 3).

Regarding claim 4, James et al discloses the claimed wherein the verification

step comprises sending a request, by the preprogrammed actions manager, to each

resource involved, for ascertaining the availability of the resources involved in view of

their respective reservation timetables (request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol,

busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line

34 and time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to col. 13, line 3).

Regarding claim 5, James et al discloses the claimed wherein, at the time

specified in the request, the preprogrammed actions manager performs the following

tasks:

reservation of the resources involved (the bridge 24 disclosed in col. 8, lines 45-

50 and request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT,

and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34);

establishment of the resource involved (the bridge 24 disclosed in col. 8, lines

45-50 and request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry protocol,

CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34);

instigating of the commands with the resources involved (the bridge 24 disclosed

in col. 8, lines 45-50 and request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry

protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34).

Regarding claim 6, James et al discloses the claimed wherein the request

comprises a start time of the action (the time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to

col. 13, line 3).

Regarding claim 7, James et al discloses the claimed wherein the request

comprises an end time of the action (the time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to

col. 13, line 3).

Regarding claim 8, James et al discloses the claimed wherein the request comprises a data item identifying a periodicity of the action (the bridge 24 disclosed in col. 8, lines 45-50 and request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34).

Regarding claim 9, James et al discloses the claimed wherein the request comprises a list of connections to be established before the action is initiated (transactions disclosed in col. 6, lines 54-61, the request subaction having targeted, transaction label, transaction label, sourceld disclosed in col. 7, lines 24-67, and the time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to col. 13, line 3).

Regarding claim 10, James et al discloses the claimed wherein the verification step comprises the step of sending, to a device control manager of a given resource listed in the request, action parameters corresponding to the resource, wherein the device control manager acts as an intermediary between the preprogrammed actions manager and the given resource (request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34 and time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to col. 13, line 3).

Regarding claim 11, James et al discloses the claimed the step of providing an identifier of an action by the preprogrammed action manager to the requesting application in case the action is accepted (request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34 and time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to col. 13, line 3).

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 6 above.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 7 above.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 9 above.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 4 above.

Regarding claim 20, James et al discloses the claimed wherein the verification step comprises the step of sending, to a device control manager of a given resource listed in the request, action parameters corresponding to the resource, wherein the device control manager acts as an intermediary between the preprogrammed actions manager and the given resource (request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34 and time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to col. 13, line 3).

Regarding claim 21, James et al discloses the claimed step of providing an identifier of an action by the preprogrammed action manager to the requesting application in case the action is accepted (request/resend protocol, reject/resend protocol, busy/retry protocol, CONFLICT, and COMPLETE disclosed col. 8, line 51 to col. 9, line 34 and time stamp disclosed from col. 12, line 57 to col. 13, line 3).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMIE ATALA whose telephone number is (571)272-7384. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JAMIE ATALA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2484